

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Upon entry of the instant amendment, Claims 12-21 are pending, Claims 13 and 18 are being amended to more particularly point out the applicant's invention. Claims 16 and 17 are being cancelled. It is respectfully submitted that upon entry of the instant amendment and consideration of the remarks below, the application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. This rejection relates to Claims 16 and 17. These claims are being cancelled. Accordingly, this objection should be overcome.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glaab et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,527,124 in view of Rutledge, U.S. Patent No. 5,864,625. It is respectfully submitted that neither the Glaab et al. nor the Rutledge patents disclose or suggest the invention reciting Claim 12. The applicant agrees that the Glaab et al. does not specifically teach a summing junction which subtracts multiple electrical signals to provide an output signal. It is also respectfully submitted that there are other elements recited in claim 12 that are not disclosed or suggested in either the Glaab et al. or the Rutledge patents. For example, claim 12 as well as claims 13, 14, 15, and 18 relate to an optical system in which the optical carrier has multiple wavelengths. Neither the Glaab et al. system nor the Rutledge system discloses an optical system for receiving and demodulating a modulated optical signal in which the optical carrier has multiple wavelengths. Indeed, the examiner's attention is directed to FIG. 1 of the Glaab et al., patent. As shown, the signal from the AM-VSB TV Channel Modulator is applied to a signal-splitter which simply splits the signal of the signal frequency into a signal having the same frequency and different phases. The examiner's attention is directed to column 3, lines 18-20. Thus, it should be clear that the system disclosed in the Glaab et al. patent has nothing to do with demodulation of the modulated optical signals which are modulated on optical carrier having

multiple wavelengths. The Rutledge patent similarly does not disclose or suggest such a system. For all the above reasons, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Glaab et al. patent in view of Nemecek et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,163,395.<sup>1</sup> As mentioned above, Claims 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, and 21 all recite a system for demodulating an optical signal that is modulated on an optical carrier having multiple wavelengths. The Glaab et al. patent has been discussed above and thoroughly does not relate to such a system. The Nemecek et al. patent similarly does not disclose a system for demodulating. Indeed, the Nemecek et al. patent relates to a single continuous wave laser whose output signal is split by an optical splitter 18. As such, it is clear that the Nemecek et al. patent also relates to an optical signal having a single frequency. For all of the above reasons, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claim.


#### CONCLUSION

An earnest attempt has been made to address each and every issue raised in the Official Action. Accordingly, an early allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN

By:

  
John S. Paniaguas  
Registration No. 31,051  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

---

<sup>1</sup> It appears that this rejection also applies to Claims 14, 15, 18, 19, and 20 based on the remarks in paragraphs 3-6 of the Detailed Action.

Appl. No.: 09/322,283  
Amdt. dated: 5/28/2004  
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2004

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman  
525 W. Monroe Street  
Suite 1600  
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693  
(312) 902-5312  
(312) 577-4532  
Customer No.: 27160